

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 10, 2010. Claims 38 and 43, each of which are independent, remain in the application. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, it is noted that paragraph 15 of the Detailed Action indicates that the Office Action is “Final” but Applicant has confirmed with the Examiner that the Office Action is “Non-Final”.

Claims 38 and 43 were objected to for an informality that is believed to be obviated by the amendments to the claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 38 and 43 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The point noted in the Office Action is also believed to be obviated by the amendments to the claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 38 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,574,798 (Bradley) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,497,186 (Kawasaki). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in light of the following comments.

The claims generally provide a way to confirm that a user has designated the correct display terminal when requesting video data. In the claims, a video server receives, from one of a plurality of control terminals, a request for video data, where the request includes video designation data designating video data to be displayed on a display terminal, display terminal designation data designating a first display terminal on which the video data is to be displayed, and first identification data identifying the first control

terminal that transmitted the video request. In response, the video server generates a first character string (e.g., “location A, Time B”) for confirming the first display terminal by a user of the first control terminal. The generated first character string is then transmitted by the video server to the first display terminal designated by the display terminal designation data, so as to cause the first display terminal to display the first character string. The video server receives a second character string from the first control terminal which transmitted the video request, wherein the second character string is input in the first control terminal by a user confirming the first character string displayed on the first display terminal, and receives second identification data of the first control terminal that transmitted the second character string. In other words, the first character string is displayed on the display terminal, and a user viewing the displayed first character string, inputs a second character string (preferably corresponding precisely to the displayed character string) into the first control terminal, whereby the user’s input and an ID of the control terminal are transmitted to the video server as confirmation data. The video server then compares the first identification data of the first control terminal that transmitted the video request with the second identification data of the first control terminal that transmitted the second character string, and compares the first character string transmitted to the first display terminal, with the second character string received from the first control terminal, so as to confirm that the user of the first control terminal has designated the correct display terminal as an output destination of the video data and that the user has not designated a wrong display terminal as the destination of the video data, according to a comparison result of both comparisons. Finally, the video server transmits the video data designated by the video designation data to the first display terminal designated by the display terminal designation data, to display the video data, if the video server confirms that the user of the first control

terminal has correctly designated the first display terminal according to a confirmation result of the two confirmations.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the video server of Claims 38 and 43. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of a video server i) generating a first character string for confirming the first display terminal by a user of the first control terminal, ii) transmitting the first character string to the first display terminal designated by the display terminal designation data, and causing the first display terminal to display the first character string, iii) receiving a second character string from the first control terminal which transmitted the video request, wherein the second character string is input in the first control terminal by a user confirming the first character string displayed on the first display terminal, and receiving second identification data of the first control terminal that transmitted the second character string, iv), a) comparing the first identification data of the first control terminal that transmitted the video request with the second identification data of the first control terminal that transmitted the second character string, b) comparing the first character string transmitted to the first display terminal, with the second character string received from the first control terminal, and c) confirming that the user of the first control terminal has designated the correct display terminal as an output destination of the video data and that the user has not designated a wrong display terminal as the destination of the video data, according to a comparison result of the comparison a) and the comparison b), and v) transmitting the video data designated by the video designation data to the first display terminal designated by the display terminal designation data, to display the video data, if the video server confirms that the user of the

first control terminal has correctly designated the first display terminal according to a confirmation result of the confirmation c).

Bradley discloses a video delivering system which displays a channel desired by a user on a display device in a room desired by the user. The system has an arrangement that provides for confirming that the room number and channel number entered by the user is correct by referring to a database. In the system of Bradley, a viewer dials the telephone number of a global authorization computer (GAC), which prompts the viewer via the phone for their room number or a pre-assigned television number. The viewer inputs the room number or TV number into the phone, and the GAC, upon receiving the room number or pre-assigned television number, prompts the viewer for the pay-for-use selection. At this point, the viewer enters the information of the video they want to watch and the GAC performs various confirmation processes regarding pre-viewing the content, payment, etc. and then the video is provided to the viewer. This system of Bradley is fundamentally different from the video server of the claims.

In this regard, in the claims, the video server receives a video request from the first control terminal, where the request includes video designation data, display terminal designation data and an ID of the first control terminal. In Bradley, the viewer calls the GAC, which may use caller-ID to identify the telephone number of the phone. However, this call does not designate the display terminal or the video data. Rather, the GAC prompts the viewer to input the room number or pre-assigned television number into the phone. That is, the GAC does not generate a first character string (e.g., the pre-assigned television number) and transmit it to the phone so that it can be displayed on the television for the viewer to then view it and input it into the phone. In fact, it appears in Bradley that the television interface portion of the system is only activated to display the

pre-view after it is confirmed that room number or pre-assigned television number is in the database of the GAC. Therefore, the claimed first reception unit/step, generating unit/step, and confirmation data transmission unit/step of the claims is not taught by Bradley.

Additionally, while the viewer of Bradley may input the room number or pre-assigned television number into the phone, this is not a second character string that is input by the user confirming the first character string displayed by the first display terminal (television) since the first character string is not sent to the TV to be displayed and the television is not displaying the first character string as discussed above.

Further, the claimed confirmation unit/step is not seen to be taught by Bradley. Here, the claims compare the first ID data of the control terminal (which would presumably correspond to the caller-ID of the phone of Bradley initially used to identify the telephone) with a second ID of the first control terminal transmitted with the second character string. This is because, in Bradley, when the user is prompted to input the room number or pre-assigned television number, and they do input it into the phone, the phone does not also transmit the claimed second identification data. Thus, there is no second identification data in Bradley to compare with the caller-ID (first identification data). Rather, Bradley merely uses the caller-ID and room number/pre-assigned television number to look up in the database whether or not the room/television is one that is authorized to use the pay-for-use system. Accordingly, Bradley is not seen to teach the claimed confirmation unit/step.

Kawasaki is not seen to make up for the foregoing deficiencies of Bradley. In this regard, Kawasaki is seen to disclose an arrangement for alerting a user to the arrival of a message from a CATV center by a LED flashing, and changing a channel upon pressing a confirmation button of a CATV terminal or of a remote control box. Thus,

Kawasaki merely teaches transmitting a signal and confirming the signal by pressing the button. Nothing has been found in Kawasaki, however, that, when combined with Bradley, would have resulted in the foregoing features of the claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Claims 38 and 43 are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

#### REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

Applicant requests to conduct a telephonic interview with the Examiner to discuss the foregoing amendments and remarks in more detail and Applicant's undersigned representative intends to contact the Examiner shortly to schedule an interview. In the event that the Examiner is ready to take up action on this Amendment prior to an interview being scheduled, it is requested that Applicant's undersigned representative be contacted to schedule the interview.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Edward Kmett /

---

Edward A. Kmett  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200